



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,213	07/17/2006	Yukitane Kimoto	BAN-06-1206	2677
35811	7590	06/04/2009	EXAMINER	
IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER US LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE 1650 MARKET ST, SUITE 4900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				BLACK, MELISSA ANN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3612				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/586,213	KIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MELISSA A. BLACK	3612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/29/09</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response Amendments and remarks filed 3/24/09. Claims 1-23 are pending in the application and rejected as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 includes the phrase "and/or" in line 2, which renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 9 includes the phrase "concave-convex" in line 4, also in claims 10-14, which renders the claim indefinite, for it unclear if the first and second surfaces have both a concave and convex surface which would mean that the surface is wavy having a curve in each direction. Concave means- curving inward; convex means- curving or bulging outward. As best understood from figure 1, the panels are convex, not both. Furthermore, "concavo" should be - - concave- -.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification fails to disclose what the panel element is and therefore will be interpreted as best understood.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the panel element must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1- 6, 9, 10, 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2002-264846A.

Re Claim 1, JP 2002-264846A discloses an FRP panel for an automobile comprising a panel element (1, 11, 31, 41, 51, 61, 71) to which a difference in rigidity and/or a difference in strength is provided between a first FRP layer (13) on a first surface side and a second FRP layer (14) on a second surface side on the opposite side of the first surface (See figures). Re Claims 2, JP 2002-264846A discloses said panel element (1, 11) is an FRP solid plate which is formed integrally with said first FRP layer (13) and said second FRP layer (14). Re Claim 3, JP 2002-264846A discloses wherein said panel element (11) is a panel element which has a space (12) between said first FRP layer (13) and said second FRP layer (14). Re Claim 4, JP 2002-264846A discloses a core material is disposed in said space (12). Re Claim 23, JP 2002-264846A discloses a difference in planar rigidity against external force is provided between said first and second FRP layers by providing a difference in hardness between a surface and a back surface of said core material (see Paragraphs [0009] and [0020]). Re Claim 5, JP 2002-264846A discloses a plurality of panel elements (13, 14) are provided, and a space is formed between adjacent panel elements (See Figures). Re Claim 6, JP 2002-264846A discloses a core material is disposed in said space (12). Re Claim 9, JP 2002-264846A discloses said difference in rigidity is provided by a condition where at least one surface of any one of said first and second FRP

layers is formed as a surface having a concave/convex shape (See figures 5, 7-10). Re Claim 10, JP 2002-264846A discloses said surface having a concave/convex shape has a planar shape extending almost straightly (Figures 4 and 5). Re claim 13, JP 2002-264846A discloses wherein said concave/convex shape is provided along an outer circumferential shape of said FRP panel for an automobile (see figure 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 7, 8 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2002-264846A.

JP 2002-264846A discloses the use of carbon-fiber for reinforcing the panels, but fails to disclose wherein said difference in rigidity and/or said difference in strength is provided by one or two or more differences selected from the group consisting of a difference in amount of

reinforcing fibers, a difference in property of reinforcing fibers and a difference in orientation of reinforcing fibers, and wherein said difference in rigidity is provided by a condition where, with respect to a running direction of said automobile, a main orientation direction of reinforcing fibers of said first FRP layer is in a range of $\pm 20^\circ$ relative to $\pm 45^\circ$ disposition, and a main orientation direction of reinforcing fibers of said second FRP layer is in a range of $\pm 20^\circ$ relative to $0^\circ/90^\circ$ disposition. JP 2002-264846A further fails to discloses said difference in strength is provided by providing a high breaking elongation layer into any one of said first and second FRP layers; said high breaking elongation layer comprises a high breaking elongation resin, and said high breaking elongation resin comprises a thermoplastic resin having a low affinity in adhesion with a matrix resin of said FRP layer; high breaking elongation layer comprises a thermoplastic resin film, a multi-layer laminated film; wherein said difference in rigidity and/or said difference in strength is provided by providing a difference in thickness between said first and second FRP layers.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to change the difference in rigidity or strength by changing the orientation of the fibers and/or putting more fibers in one panel over the other, for it is commonly known in the art of working with carbon fiber. The layers are usually laminated together and the fibers are laid at different angles. As for the breaking elongation, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to for thermoplastic resins are well known in the art and changing the composition of them to strengthen or weaken them is well known in the art also, as for the material being laminated, it is common to laminate carbon fiber

to strengthen the material. Furthermore these are mere design choices and require little to no skill in the art.

Applicant may seasonably challenge, for the official record in this application, this and any other statement of judicial notice in timely manner in response to this office action. Please specify the exact statement to be challenged. Applicant is reminded, with respect to the specific challenge put forth, of the duty of disclosure under Rule 56 to disclose material which is pertinent to patentability including claim rejections challenged by applicant.

11. Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2002-264846A in view of US Pat # 7,150,496 to Fujimoto.

JP 2002-264846A fails to disclose the use a panel plane is sectioned in a lattice-like form into nearly rectangular areas by said concave/convex shape into nearly diamond-shaped areas by said concave/convex shape, and wherein said concave/convex shape is provided so as to depict a multiple closed curved line with a nearly concentric analog formation on a panel plane, wherein said concave/convex shape is provided along an outer circumferential shape of said FRP panel for an automobile, wherein said difference in strength is provided by introducing a plurality of discontinuous part of a reinforcing fiber substrate into at least one reinforcing fiber substrate layer of any one of said first and second FRP layers, wherein the discontinuous part extends almost straightly.

Fujimoto teaches the use a panel plane is sectioned in a lattice-like form into nearly rectangular areas by said concave/convex shape into nearly diamond-shaped areas by said concave/convex shape, and wherein said concave/convex shape is provided so as to depict a multiple closed curved line with a nearly concentric analog formation on a panel plane, wherein

said concave/convex shape is provided along an outer circumferential shape of said FRP panel for an automobile, wherein said difference in strength is provided by introducing a plurality of discontinuous part of a reinforcing fiber substrate into at least one reinforcing fiber substrate layer of any one of said first and second FRP layers, wherein the discontinuous part extends almost straightly (See Figures 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to change the shape of the panel plane as taught by Fujimoto on the device of JP 2002-264846A in order to change the energy absorption of the panel during impact, furthermore changing the shape and/or size of an object is considered to be a design choice.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 24March2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims were broadly interpreted based on the claim language and applicants discloses. The panel member is not labeled in the specification or figures, therefore applicants submission would be considered new matter if added to the specification, furthermore, the attached tables do not specifically point out what the "panel element" is either.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA A. BLACK whose telephone number is (571)272-4737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-3:30 ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dayoan can be reached on (571) 272-6659. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. A. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3612

/Hilary Gutman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3612